

1 Brett L. Gibbs, Esq. (SBN 251000)  
 2 Prenda Law Inc.  
 3 38 Miller Avenue, #263  
 4 Mill Valley, CA 94941  
 5 415-325-5900  
 6 [blgibbs@wefightpiracy.com](mailto:blgibbs@wefightpiracy.com)

7 *Attorney for Plaintiff*

8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

BOY RACER, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOES 2-72,

Defendants.

No. C-11-02833 EJD

**NOTICE OF VOLUNTARY  
 DISMISSAL OF ACTION WITHOUT  
 PREJUDICE ONLY AS TO ONE  
 ANONYMOUS DOE DEFENDANT**

**NOTICE OF VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL OF ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE ONLY AS  
 TO ONE ANONYMOUS DOE DEFENDANT**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1), Plaintiff voluntarily dismisses all claims *without prejudice* brought in this action against a single anonymous Doe Defendant associated with the following Internet Protocol ("IP") address: 98.255.135.206. As noted on Exhibit A to Plaintiff's original Complaint (*see* 5:cv-11-01958, ECF No. 1), this IP address was issued by Comcast Cable Communications, and Doe Defendant was personally observed by Plaintiff's agents using this IP address in the particular swarm identified in this case unlawfully infringing Plaintiff's copyrighted works in March of 2011.<sup>1</sup> Further, from other

<sup>1</sup> This of course, is not the only times this Doe Defendant was in the swarm, but rather the only times personally observed and his or her available information captured by Plaintiff's agents' proprietary technology.

1 information gained through Plaintiff's agents' proprietary technology and general research, this Doe  
2 Defendant appears to have not only infringed upon Plaintiff's copyrighted works in this case, but  
3 also used the same IP address to infringe upon other works produced by Plaintiff. Plaintiff hereby  
4 chooses to dismiss Doe Defendant associated with IP addresses 98.255.135.206 *without prejudice*  
5 to pursue that individual in a separate consolidated lawsuit.  
6

7 In accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1), the Doe Defendant has neither  
8 filed an answer to Plaintiff's Complaint, nor a motion for summary judgment. Dismissal under  
9 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1) is therefore appropriate.

10 Plaintiff still maintains its claims against the other active anonymous Doe Defendant(s)  
11 remaining in this action, and reserves the right to name such individuals and/or serve them when in  
12 possession of their identifying information in this case.

13 Respectfully Submitted,  
14

15  
16 PRENDA LAW INC.,

17 **DATED: November 20, 2011**

18 By: /s/ Brett L. Gibbs, Esq.

19 Brett L. Gibbs, Esq. (SBN 251000)  
20 Prenda Law Inc.  
21 38 Miller Avenue, #263  
22 Mill Valley, CA 94941  
[blgibbs@wefightpiracy.com](mailto:blgibbs@wefightpiracy.com)  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on November 20, 2011, all individuals of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served a true and correct copy of the foregoing document, and all attachments and related documents, using the Court's ECF system, in compliance with Local Rule 5-6 and General Order 45.

/s/ Brett L. Gibbs  
Brett L. Gibbs, Esq.